

Message

From: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: 4/24/2019 5:36:25 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) [derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]; Banister, Stephen D CIV USN (USA) [stephen.banister@navy.mil]
CC: john.sourial@errg.com; Sanchez, Yolanda [Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov]; Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]; Yogi, David [Yogi.David@epa.gov]; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org) [amy.brownell@sfdph.org]; kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org; Craig Bias [cbias@remwerks.com]
Subject: SYR public comments - please address in responsiveness summary
Attachments: Greenaction's Supplemental Parcel G Work Plan Comments; Hunters Point Naval Shipyard PRGs; Hunters Pt presentation for Friday; Letter re: Draft Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan, HPNS; Re: Hunters Pt; Supplemental HPS Info Requested by EPA at Our Feb Mtg_.msg

Dear Derek and Steve,

As Enrique said in his April 11, 2019, letter, we recommend that you draft a responsiveness summary to public comments received on the draft *Five-Year Review*. Public interest has remained strong, especially about the long-term protectiveness evaluation that the Navy is conducting. The Navy and/or EPA have received public comments in various forms after those submitted by September 14, 2018, in response to the Navy's July 9, 2018, draft version *Five-Year Review* posted online. These include the attached emails, letters, power point presentations, and other documents. In addition, here is a link to the "minutes" (i.e., presentations) of the January 28, 2019 Environmental & Reuse Subcommittee of the HPS CAC.

In our April 11, 2019, letter, we requested the Navy issue the final *Five-Year Review* report only after a public comment period on the PRG Calculator assessments. The *Five-Year Review* would include formal detailed Responses to Comments from regulatory agencies, per the FFA agreement Section 7.7(e), and a responsiveness summary to substantive comments from the public. Please include these forms of public with the other comments already received, and please address substantive comments as part of the forthcoming *Five-Year Review* responsiveness summary we have recommended in our letter. OSWER's 1990 Directive on "Superfund Responsiveness Summaries" gives more specific information about the process. For example, here are some relevant excerpts:

"A responsiveness summary should reflect a genuine attempt to come to grips with citizens' questions and concerns..." A responsiveness summary is important, because "it provides the decision-maker with information about the views of the public..." and "it documents how comments have been considered..."

Please contact me or Yolanda Sanchez (415-972-3880) if you would like to discuss these further.

Lily